THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL PULPIT.

SERMON BY THE REV. ETHAN ALLEN.

VOL. V. September, 1835. [NO. IX.

TO WHAT CHURCH SHOULD I BELONG?

A Sermon,

BY THE REV. ETHAN ALLEN,

RECTOR OF CHRIST CHURCH, DAYTON, OHIO.

Acts ii. 47—"*And the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved.*"

My hearers will at once perceive, that this is simply the statement of a fact, and to the Christian, a fact of intense interest. It announces for our information, and for our deliberate consideration also, what were the then daily doings of our Lord and Saviour, to that church which he purchased with his blood.

I look at the disciples, as they were left by their Master when he ascended up on high, and I see that they were left in the territory of their open and determined foes. I perceive indeed, that their numbers were not few, for they had been gathered from the frequent multitudes which followed him, not only throughout Judea, Samaria and Galilee, but also in Syria, in Idumea, and beyond Jordan. And so numerous were they found, in Galilee for instance, that five hundred came to meet their risen Jesus at one time. But although thus numerous, they were as sheep without a shepherd, scattered upon the mountains and in the wilderness, exposed on every hand to beasts of prey. They were separated from each other, destitute of leaders, and without organization, disheartened and desponding. The eleven apostles, however, with somewhat more than one hundred others, continued daily to assemble, and that, too, in the very city of the crucifixion. In this manner ten days were almost passed away, when on a sudden the Holy Ghost in power descended, and thousands were added to their number, ere that day's sun was faded from the west. And now, the church stood forth before the public eye in all its prominency

and completeness. Its ministry came fully into view; baptism was administered by it in due form, and received by the converted, in public attestation of their discipleship and union with the kingdom of the crucified. This was the beginning, and it was glorious—and so was its continuance; for thereafter *daily* did the LORD add to the church the saved, so that in a few days only, the number of the men amounted to five thousand. This was indeed the LORD'S own doings, and is still marvellous in our eyes. And shall such triumphs once more bless the church and world? GOD in his mercy hasten them, for JESUS' sake!

I. In calling your attention to the text before us, I remark,

1. That the church of CHRIST was now fully constituted, and as such presents itself before us.—And in the first place, as you perceive, it was a *visible body*, a body made up of living men, and admitted into it in the reception of a visible ordinance, being baptized in the name of JESUS CHRIST. In the second place, you may perceive, that as a whole, it was *one church*. It consisted, most unquestionably, of many separate congregations or churches in Jerusalem, for it numbered upwards of three thousand members. They were not large, however, for Christians then had not buildings erected and set apart for public worship, as they have now. They met together in such numbers only, as private dwellings could accommodate—hence, the frequent expression in the Epistles, "the church in thy house." Yet as a whole they were but one church, and continued steadfastly in communion with the apostles. (Acts 2: 42.) In the third place, it was as you likewise will perceive, under the *government and direction of the apostles*. Presbyters might have been appointed and ordained, but we have no express record that the church in Jerusalem had them, till some years after this; and the order of deacons was certainly not yet instituted. There being twelve apostles, no other ministers were as yet, deemed necessary. Such was its ministry; and such therefore, was the church then—*one*, *visible* and *apostolic*.

2. And now, mark who were added to it. Our text tells us, that they were *the saved*—not *such as should be* saved, as in our translation—but *the saved*. So say commentators—so saith the original—so say all translations other than our own. There are no words

in the original, answering to the words "*such as should be*"—it is simply *the saved* who were added. Nor is the phrase, *the saved*, at all peculiar in its application here. It is so used elsewhere. To the Corinthians, said St. Paul, (1 Ep. 1: 18,) the preaching of the cross to the lost is foolishness, but to *the saved*, it is the power of GOD. And again, (2 Ep. 2: 15) we are unto GOD, a sweet savour of CHRIST in *the saved*, and in the lost.

By this designation, we understand those who are rescued from that lost estate in which those originally are whom Christ came to seek. They are those who believe in the LORD JESUS CHRIST, (Acts 16: 31) and are justified by his blood; (Rom. 5: 9) who have received the renewing of the HOLY GHOST, (Tit. 3: 5) being converted and become as little children. Such, if we rightly apprehend the Scriptures, are *the saved;* and such were they who were added to the church. It was not therefore, all of every character who might apply, that were added; it was the saved—in other words, the converted, the spiritually renewed. The door of entrance now, seems sometimes to be thrown open wide, and all are admitted without regard to spiritual character, who can be persuaded to come in; but a day of separation will come, when the chaff shall be winnowed from the wheat, and cast away as worthless.

3. But let it not be overlooked, that the saved were added to the church *by the* LORD. Men speak now of joining the church as if it were their own work simply, and altogether voluntary. But our text tells us that *the* LORD added to the church the saved. It therefore was *his* doing, and not man's, any further than he was agent merely. We understand, and are not aware that others understand it differently, that it was done by his ministers in the rite of baptism. For it is to be remembered, that he did not add them, by causing them to become penitent believers; it was after they were already become such, that they were added by him—it was the already saved thus added. And it should be kept prominently in view, that all who are baptized, are *by that act* added to the church,* and are thus in fact members of the church, even though they be not

* To show that I am not mistaken in this, I may refer the reader, as I have done before, to our 27th article, which I need not repeat, and to the "Presbyterian form of discipline and Government," chap. 1. sec. 1. which says, *inasmuch as baptised persons are members of the church, they are, &c.* The Baptists are known to entertain the same idea.

communicants. The idea that persons join the church only when they become communicants is not scriptural.

II. We are thus shown then, by the subject as now presented;

1. That it is the LORD'S purpose that the renewed, the saved, should be added to the church. If it be not so, we must concede that he acts in what he does without a purpose, just as men frequently are wont themselves to do. This, however, was unquestionably his course then. And it will, we doubt not by all be readily admitted, that a general course is only in accordance with general principles and purposes, and furnish their development. If this be so, and the written record is correct, it is the LORD'S purpose that the saved shall be added to the church *now*, and in all time to come, even as in time so long passed by.

2. It is not therefore a voluntary matter, whether the converted belong to the church or not—and the church is not, as by some supposed, merely a voluntary association. In other words, being added to the church is not a matter which the saved may comply with or neglect, just as they may please, and with the same propriety. There being, however, several congregations of the church in the same place *duly* constituted and organized, it is unquestionably a voluntary matter to which the renewed may individually belong. In the early ages, as the church met, as we have seen, in private houses, undoubtedly the members severally chose at whose house they statedly would meet. But it was not left to them to settle, whether they would be members of the church at all, or not. The Lord took this thing into his own hands, and it was he, and not others, who added, or caused the saved to be added to the church.

I. It is then, we argue, matter of personal obligation to the renewed, that they be added to the church. The reasons of this obligation I will briefly state.

1. The LORD has actually planted his church among men,—about this there is no dispute. And he has constituted it in the language of the text, of the saved—designing, as he has told us, that it spread and expand itself the wide world over, as well as continue simply its existence. But its existence even, cannot be continued, unless the saved shall themselves be added to it; and no one therefore among the renewed, may refuse to be thus added.

For if *one* may do so with propriety, all others might precisely on the same ground; and the church would in that case ultimately become extinct, and the saved themselves would be instrumental in its destruction, instead of its perpetuity and increase.

2. Again, the LORD has given his church the ordinance of baptism, and requires his ministry to administer it to all whom they may disciple. A prominent effect of its being received is, to say the least, being added to the church. Now if the saved refuse to be added to the church, they renounce an ordinance of the LORD'S, that is, baptism—nay, they prevent the ministry from doing, as by their LORD instructed, and blot out, so far as they are personally concerned, a positive ordinance of their SAVIOUR and their Judge.

3. Still further, in the text before us, we have the record of the LORD'S own doing in this very matter, and are thus shown, what his purpose respecting it is; and shown what it is, in a manner perfectly unequivocal. It was not an individual instance—it was his daily doings; and to men who submit to his government, will he not do the same even now? Where is his declaration, where the intimation even, to the contrary? You will look for them in vain.

I may ask then, with pointed emphasis, are the renewed under no obligation to fulfil, as far as they may, the solemn purposes of the LORD their GOD? Are they under no obligation to submit to an ordinance of his appointing, or perpetuate the church which he is building up? May they, so far as their failure to be added to the church may go, run counter to, and frustrate the distinctly avowed purposes of GOD? May they, so far as they are themselves concerned, blot out an ordinance of his appointment from the statute book which he has given, and joining by their neglect, in league with the world and with the devil, be found arrayed against the progress and existence even of the church? O no, they may not do it. Their eternal salvation is involved, for he who shall destroy the church of GOD, him shall GOD destroy. (1 Cor. 3: 17 *marg.*) The obligation then, is alike clear and solemn, and its violation is fraught with consequences alike personal, fearful and enduring.

II. But here a difficulty presents itself; the renewed are ready, and anxious perhaps, to be added to the church, but then it is asked,

to what church shall I be added? for I find many churches so called, each claiming from me membership.

1. To aid in the settling of this difficulty in our own minds, I may state, that the church to which those were added, who are spoken of in our text, was the *church under the administration and government of the apostles.* This is not denied. Now if there be a church under such supervision still, and others, that by their own admission are not, to which we ask ourselves, should the renewed be added? Did the LORD himself add the saved in the instance before us, to the church under apostolic supervision, and may the renewed go counter to his example, and choose *now* one not so organized, opposing thus their choice to his? Is there not clearly obligation in the one case, and hazard in the other? Now the church Episcopal, in all its branches, does claim to possess, and to be under the apostolic office, even at the present time. Churches not of the Episcopal order,* make no such claim. Nay, so far from claiming it, that they avow distinctly, I quote the words of Dr. Campbell of Edinburgh, that the apostolic office "was one of those extraordinary offices which were in their nature temporary, and did not admit of succession,"† and of course that when the twelve died, the apostolic office died with them. Theirs therefore, by their own express admission, is not so constituted, as was the church mentioned in our text. They lay no claim to the possession of that office. But they not only do not claim it for themselves, they deny its existence in any branch whatever of the church. And is their denial sustained? Or does the office notwithstanding still exist? We are reminded that the *work* which the office was created to accomplish, that is the salvation of men by the preaching of the gospel, is not yet accomplished but in part, and consequently the probability naturally would be, that the office is not cast aside which was designed for its accomplishment.—We also are reminded that the LORD promised to be with the apostles to the end of the world, (Mat. 28: 20) and argue conclusively, that as they could

*I call them *churches*, and so *in fact* they are. We are not aware that any deny them to be so, though we hold them not to be quite so *perfect* in some respects, as the church Episcopal, as our argument shows, but perhaps more so in others. God forbid that we should *glory* save in the cross of our LORD JESUS CHRIST.

† Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, by G. Campbell, D. D. pp. 57, Phila. ed. 1807.

not possibly have been expected to live thus long, the promise must relate to them officially, including their successors with themselves; and consequently that the office must still exist.—We are reminded likewise, that it certainly requires as great a power to *abolish* an office, as to *create* it, and are challenged to prove that CHRIST has any where announced its discontinuance; a challenge which we cannot meet. And here the claim of the continuance of this office might rest itself with entire confidence.

But the matter demands our attention further. At the time of the ascension, the apostles, as we are well aware, were in number but eleven; for Judas had fallen from his ministry and apostleship by his transgression. To that same ministry and apostleship from which he thus fell, the apostles—the LORD himself making choice between two candidates, (Acts 1: 24)—appointed Matthias, (: 26.) This instance, which is not disputed, distinctly shows us that the office did admit of succession; for if there might be succession in this case, there might unquestionably be in others. But the number as we find was not confined to twelve, for in a few years after this, and that too after the order of deacons had been created and the church had been provided with presbyters also, we have mention made of two additional apostles, namely, Paul and Barnabas. (Acts 14: 14.) In writing to the Romans, St. Paul mentions two more, Andronicus and Junius, as being of note, eminent among the apostles. (16: 7.) In writing to the Corinthians, he calls Titus and two others, whose names he does not give us, "apostles of churches." (2 Ep. 8: 23.) In writing to the Galatians, he speaks of James, the LORD's brother, as an apostle. (1: 19.) In writing to the Philippians, he calls Epaphroditus their apostle. (2: 25.) And in writing to the Thessalonians, he mentions Sylvanus and Timothy, as apostles with himself. (1 Ep. 1: 1. Compare 2: 6.) Here then, we have mention made *in scripture* of twelve beside the original twelve, in all making *twenty-four*. And then, in Revelation, there is mention made of seven "angels of churches" denoting the same precisely, as "apostles of churches," that is, those who are sent to announce a message. So that of this class of the ministry, there are THIRTY-ONE mentioned in the inspired history, continuing along down during a period of seventy years. If all these

facts then, prove any thing to us, they are full proof that the office of apostle was not temporary in its nature, but did admit distinctly of succession. Such indeed was the decision of the church for fifteen centuries; for notwithstanding all its conflicts, its darkness and its ultimate degradation, it universally, during that period, did preserve that office; when at the same time, it had well nigh buried the prominent truths, which it was the business of the office to disseminate. And it is now, the decision of eleven-twelfths* nearly, of the church called Christian, who, notwithstanding whatever errors some of its various parts may hold, continue to retain that office still. It therefore, as we find, still exists, and within the church Episcopal, in all its branches, in the office called Episcopal, which is but another name *now* for apostolic, the incumbents of which we call bishops. Now, if this church then, has it, being in this respect like that mentioned in our text, and other churches renounce all pretension to it, is there no obligation on our part, if renewed, to be added to the church thus having it? Did the LORD himself add the saved to such a church in all its earliest ages? We ask then, may we, as the saved, go counter thereunto now, and violate no obligation in so doing? We cannot help regarding this view of the case, as settling *for us*, the question fairly and conclusively; we do not say *for others*, for to their own MASTER do they stand or fall.

But, secondly, I have still further views to present, in connexion with this office. By *neglecting to be added* to a church, having the Episcopal or apostolic office, we should ourselves feel, that in so doing, we were *rejecting, in fact, an institution of* CHRIST. That CHRIST himself created that office admits no question; (see John 20: 21) it is allowed by all, it is denied by none. And that it was

* This enumeration not only includes the Episcopal Church, so called in this country, but also the same church in England, Ireland, and Scotland; Canada and Hindostan; in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and the Moravian church; likewise the Greek church proper and the Russian; the Roman, Syrian, Armenian, Coptic, Abyssinian and the Methodist Episcopal Church also, who have bishops *by name*. They all have the apostolic office of the ministry still. Whatever else any of them may have corrupted or cast off, they have not cast off this. The population comprised in the names above mentioned, is estimated, and by non-Episcopal writers too, at 246,000,000 (that of non-Episcopal 36,000,000) being forty-one forty-sevenths, nearly eleven-twelfths, or more than five-sixths of the Christian world. The whole being 282,000,000.

the only office of the ministry, which he personally did institute, there is no record to the contrary. That the office was ever *abolished by* HIM, is not pretended. And to this identical office, under GOD, the church owes its very existence. For it was by its ministrations, that the three thousand were added on the day of Pentecost, and that the saved were added daily to the church. And shall the renewed, we ask ourselves, now reject the only office of the ministry, instituted personally by their LORD and MASTER whom they love and serve, and to whom the church owes actually its being? Are they not under obligations which they cannot cancel, but are answerable for fulfilling, to be added to that church, which is under the supervision of that office? But it is not an office simply, that I plead for, it is *an institution of our blessed* SAVIOUR. And if we love our SAVIOUR, shall we not love his *ordinance*, when assured beyond all question that it is his? Who that thinks him perfect in wisdom, being even the wisdom of GOD, will not esteem it decidedly unwise, to cast it utterly aside? And yet this would be actually done by us, in not being added to some one of the branches of the church Episcopal.

But more than this, to neglect being added to the church under this order of the ministry, is, thirdly, as we feel, not only in fact rejecting it, and thus despising it, but would be by direct consequence, in *this one thing*, despising CHRIST himself. For we remember, that it was to his ministry, that JESUS said, "he that despiseth you despiseth me," and at once concede, that the apostles cannot be more decidedly despised, than by rejecting the office which, as such, they held. And if we despise thus an institution of CHRIST'S own creating, do we not in truth, in so doing, despise himself? As the renewed of GOD'S own spirit therefore, it becomes a matter of solemn consideration, for we would not knowingly be found rejecting it. We cannot help perceiving thus, that it is a matter in which our own blessed JESUS is himself personally concerned, and that on him directly does the rejection itself recoil. Oh, if there be an obligation resting on us then, as Christians, to follow the SAVIOUR, and receive what he has given his church; if there be an obligation resting on us, to be added to the church,

it does seem to me, that we are under unquestionable obligation, to be added to the church Episcopal, in some one of its different branches, which only has the apostolic office in her ministry. He has warned us solemnly against not receiving it. Whosoever, said he, shall not receive *you*, &c. verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city; (Mat. 9: 14;) and we cannot therefore knowingly reject it, as we value all that we may hope for from his favour, and from his intercessions at the throne on high.

2. But independently and separately from all that we have now advanced, we feel that a yet further and distinct obligation arises, from the fact, *that the neglect to be added to the church Episcopal, must be followed by rejection of that doctrine of* CHRIST, *the* LAYING ON OF HANDS, *called Confirmation.* In Heb. 6: 2, the apostle enumerates the laying on of hands, as among the principles of the doctrine of CHRIST; and enumerates it along with repentance, faith, baptisms, the resurrection and eternal judgment; placing it directly after baptism. It is then, just as these are, one of the doctrines of CHRIST, and an elementary doctrine. It is consequently among those things, which were to be communicated at an early stage of the Christian profession, and is one of those doctrines in which every individual confessedly, is personally interested, and in which all Christians consequently, are certainly concerned. Hence we find, as related in the Acts of the apostles, Peter and John and Paul administering this rite, and the disciples already baptized, submitting to receive it. That we may not be suspected of partiality in thus interpreting the apostle to speak here of what we call confirmation, I may state, that such is the interpretation of divines not of the church Episcopal. Baxter, in his treatise on confirmation, written after he became a non-conformist, states, that "the universal church of Christ have used confirmation by prayer and laying on of hands, as a practice received from the apostles, and that no other beginning of it can be found." Calvin too, admits "that it was an ancient custom of the church," and so does the commentator Owen. And a committee of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the U. S. in 1813, quote their ad-

missions with decided approbation.* The laying on of hands then, is a doctrine of CHRIST. But, as it can be administered only by bishops, men in the apostolic office, it cannot be rightfully administered, in any church where they do not exist. And in that church therefore, where they are not found, this one of the principles of the doctrine of CHRIST, is cast out of all observance. But what becomes of the obligation to receive it, if we as the saved, neglect to be added to the church, where only, it can by us be received? Is it cancelled? Most certainly it is not. It is disregarded, it is violated by us. Would it then, be either right or safe for us, even though renewed, to be added to a church, where this elementary doctrine—we knowing it to be such—cannot be received? Should we not expose ourselves to be beaten with many stripes in so doing? If it be safe to reject this, why is it not safe to reject any other doctrine which may be found inexpedient or inconvenient? Are not CHRIST'S instructions, in either case, alike evaded? If one may be rejected, certainly the infidel is not so monstrously inconsistent in rejecting others; for he does not reject all the doctrines of the bible. He goes along with the Christian at least half way in the receiving of them.

3. But again, the church to which those in our text were added, was *one church*. That the church general is not so now, is as lamentable as it is true. But that it is the duty of the renewed, and solemn duty, to endeavour as far as in them lies, to make it one again, we cannot question, we cannot venture to deny. To accomplish this, the church Episcopal, in that branch with which we are connected, presents herself as ready to give up whatever in her forms, her doctrine or organization, shall be shown to be unscriptural. But as to her organization, built as she is upon the apostles, JESUS CHRIST himself being her chief corner stone, to cast them aside in the persons of their successors, would be to undermine the building. She feels that her ministry, and her rite of confirmation also, are not only scriptural, but that *they are the unrepealed institutions of her* LORD. And if they are so, will not more light

* See "Report of the Committee of the General Assembly appointed to draft a plan for disciplining baptized Children." That Committee consisted of "JAMES RICHARDS, SAMUEL MILLER and JOHN B. ROMEYN."

and love, she asks, bring all Christians conscientiously to receive them? As to her doctrines, what is there in them, she demands, that others of evangelical faith do not receive? Can instances be pointed out? Her forms of worship are indeed by some objected to, yet seldom does a candid examination fail to remove the objections from the mind of him who makes them, though at the same time they lay no claim to any absolute perfection. It is supposed by some, however, that she is not calculated to promote in her members, attainments of elevated piety and zeal. And yet there were Baxter, Whitfield and Wesley, men acknowledged to be eminent in piety, by their followers at least, who, however far they wandered from them in after life, were *trained up*, and entered on their ministry within her folds. And so also were John Newton, Thomas Scott and Henry Martyn, whose praise is in all the churches. That some are not what they might be in this respect, is only what we find true elsewhere also, and is always to be regretted deeply. But it is the fault of our nature, and not of the church always, in which they may be found.

We turn to those not of the church Episcopal, and we find that once they were all alike members of her own fold. The reasons of their separation, we need not undertake to state. But we may say, that we know of no one on account of which they separated originally, but what, in the branch of the church Episcopal, in this country, is actually removed. Why then, we ask ourselves, when all the original causes of separation are removed, should they not return and be again one? Is there no obligation arising from the *oneness of* CHRIST, their acknowledged head, to do so? Far be it from us to say, that they may not be eminently pious, and eminently active in the cause of JESUS, where they are. We bring no such charge. We would not throw the smallest obstacle in their way of advancing CHRIST'S cause all they may. We do *not forbid them, because they follow not with us.* But then, did not CHRIST pray that his disciples might be all one? Do not the scriptures pointedly reprobate schisms and divisions, and tell us that they who promote them are carnal, (1 Cor. 3: 3,) and influenced by a wisdom that is from beneath? (Jas. 3: 14, 15, 16) And yet those not of the church Episcopal, we find do not unite among

themselves; so far from it, that divisions are constantly multiplying.* There are among them in this country, not less than forty sects and divisions within my own knowledge.† They have separated from each other again and again, and there is no ground common among themselves on which they may unite. So evidently as we perceive thus, does their course not lead to union. If however they are in solemn duty bound to become one, and yet so evidently cannot among themselves, and if all obstacles originally existing, are now removed, so that they may once more return to the fold their fathers left, is there no obligation that the renewed among them should? The evils of disunion are so numerous, so fatal, and so alarming—preventing combined action in the common cause against the common enemy, giving cause for triumph to the infidel and the scoffer, weakening the energies of the church, and leaving it frequently a prey to its enemies, creating mutual contentions and unnatural enmities, and stopping so entirely the onward progress of the ark—what Christian but what from his heart must feel, that great sacrifices even, should be made to avoid and heal them? And if union with the church Episcopal will accomplish this, we do feel as if Christians cannot resist the obligation it imposes, without much difficulty. And we call on all around us to behold her—to see of what beauty and of what strength is the wall placed around her vineyard, how noble are her towers and bulwarks, and how well fitted for security! If few trees of righteousness may seem to any one yet growing there, and thorns and briars are found now and then, it only shows that there is room enough yet, and that labourers are needed. We see indeed, in other enclosures, vines full of fruit and thrifty—the ground much cultivat-

*The Hicksites, the Campbellites, and Protestant Methodists, are recent instances; others are anticipated.

†Among the Baptists, are the General, the Particular, Keithites or Quaker Baptists, Dunkards, River Brethren, Seven-day, Freewill, Campbellites, &c. Among the Congregationalists, the Orthodox and Unitarians. Among the Presbyterians, the Scotch, Cameronians, Presbyterians of the General Assembly—Old and New School, Associate Reformed, Seceders, Covenanters, Reformed, Associate and Cumberland Presbyterians, German Presbyterians, English Lutherans, German do., German Calvinists, German Reformed, Dutch do., New Lights, &c. Among the Methodists, are the Episcopal Methodists, United Brethren, (Dutch) Christians, Protestant Methodists, &c. also, the Friends, Swedenborgians, Universalists, Mennonites, Shakers, Mormonites, &c.

ed, and the young plants thickly springing up. But by and by, the lion of the wilderness comes along, (1 Pet. 5: 8,) and we mark how easily he breaks in, and how surely he devours and scatters destruction on every side. Now just let those tender plants and fruitful vines be transplanted within the wall of that vineyard of which we have been speaking, then will they flourish certainly not less, and be safe from the destroyer of the wild wood. Then will there be but one fold only, and that one under the guardian care of one great shepherd, JESUS CHRIST.

And now then, if the renewed are under any obligation to aim to make the whole church one again, if they are under obligation to receive every doctrine of CHRIST; if they are under obligation not to reject the ministry of his appointment, and to be added to the church under its supervision, O tell me are they under no obligation to be added to the church Episcopal.

And let the principal office of CHRIST'S ministry be no longer rejected by his followers, and let them be added to the church under its supervision; let them receive each and every doctrine of CHRIST JESUS, and let them be all one again, of one heart and one soul, and will she not stand forth once more, in all her pristine glory? Will she not once more, think you, reap triumphs as glorious as were those of old? Will not the saved be *daily* added to her fold, and the world by multitudes bow down before the cross of CHRIST? Then will there be no longer worn distinctive names, save the name of CHRIST, and that shall be inscribed on every forehead. One prayer shall ascend from every heart, and loud hallelujahs shall greet the spreading firmament above. Shall that day ever come? Let me do what I may to advance its advent, and to Israel's GOD shall be the everlasting praise.

"Now unto him that is able to keep us from falling, and present us faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise GOD our SAVIOUR, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and for ever. Amen."

RUIN OF ANTICHRIST.

"I lift my Banner," saith the Lord,
"Where Antichrist has stood;
The city of my Gospel foes
Shall be a field of blood.

"My heart has studied just revenge,
And now the day appears;
The day of my redeem'd is come,
To wipe away their tears.

"Quite weary is my patience grown,
And bids my fury go;
Swift as the lightning it shall move,
And prove as fatal too.

"I call for helpers, but in vain;
Then has my Gospel none?
Well my own arm has might enough
To crush my foes alone.

"Slaughter, and my devouring sword,
Shall walk the streets around;
BABEL shall reel beneath my stroke,
And stagger to the ground."

Thy honours, O victorious King!
Thine own right hand shall raise,
While we thine awful vengeance sing,
And our Deliverer praise.

THE SAFETY AND PROTECTION OF THE CHURCH.

How honourable is the place
Where we adoring stand,
Zion, the glory of the earth,
And beauty of the land.

Bulwarks of mighty grace defend
The city where we dwell;
The walls, of strong salvation made,
Defy the assaults of Hell.

Lift up the everlasting gates,
The doors wide open fling,
Enter ye nations that obey
The statutes of our King.

Here shall you taste unmingled joys,
And live in perfect peace;
You that have known Jehovah's name,
And ventur'd on his grace.

Trust in the Lord, *for ever* trust,
And banish all your fears;
Strength in the LORD JEHOVAH dwells,
ETERNAL as His years.

What tho' the rebels dwell on high,
His arm shall bring them low:
Low as the caverns of the grave,
Their lofty heads shall bow.

On BABYLON our feet shall tread,
In that rejoicing hour;
The ruins of her walls shall spread
A pavement for the poor.